

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated December 8, 2003.

Claims 1-3, 5, 11-15 and 17-19 have been amended and claims 6-10 have been canceled.

Claims 1-5 and 11-19 are presented for further examination.

In the December 8, 2003 Office Action, the examiner rejected (1) claims 1-19 as anticipated by Thomas, (2) claims 1-14 and 17-19 as anticipated by Rebernak, (3) claims 1-14 and 17-19 as anticipated by Cormier, (4) claims 1-14 and 17-19 as anticipated by Wheeler, (5) claims 15 and 16 as obvious in view of Rebernak, (6) claims 15 and 16 as obvious in view of Cormier, (7) claims 15 and 16 as anticipated or obvious in view of Wheeler. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The claims as amended are distinguishable from the prior art of record. First, the claims as amended require: (1) an indentation in at least one of the left and right side surfaces of the body and in the bottom surface of the body; and (2) that the top surface adjoins the left and right side surfaces of the body. Thus, as now amended the claims require that the indentation does not touch or extend to the top surface of the body. Second, the claims as amended also require that the indentation extends from the front to back surface of the body. Thus, as now amended, the claims require the indentation does not extend along the front or back surfaces of the body (*i.e.* not extending from the left side to the right side of the body). Finally, the claims require that the indentation has a uniform cross section. Thus, the claims as now amended, require that the cross section of the indentation does not vary along its extent from the front to rear surfaces of the body.

In view of these requirements of the claims, the claims now clearly distinguish from the prior art. In Thomas, the indentation 7 (Figs. 1 and 2) touches the top surface of the mop head

and also does not have a uniform cross section throughout its extent from the front to back surfaces of the mop head (Fig. 2). In Rebernak, the indentations 27 and 28 (Figs. 2, 4) and 30, 33, 35 and 36 (Figs. 5-7) extend along the front and back surfaces of the mop head and therefore are not in the left and right side surfaces of the mop head and do not extend from the front to back surface of the mop head. In Wheeler, the indentations comprise cutting the corners off the mop head when viewed from above or below (Figs. 1, 2). Hence, the indentation touches the top surface of the mop head and does not have a uniform cross section from the front surface to the back surface (Figs. 1, 2). Cormier is a snow rake not a mop head. The inapplicability of this reference to a mop head is manifested by the rigid plate (15) on the bottom surface (Fig. 6) that would preclude its application as a mop head. Moreover, in Cormier there are indentations in the top surface of the snow rake (17).

Thus, as now amended the claims are distinguishable from the prior art of record. Allowance of pending claims 1-5 and 11-19 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees required for consideration of this Amendment on the merits to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4364-4000.

**PATENT**  
**Docket No.: 4364-4000**

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is further requested to grant that petition for such length extension of time needed to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Abate  
Reg. No. 32,527

Dated: March 8, 2003  
CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10154  
(212) 758-4800 Telephone  
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile